



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/525,707	03/14/2000	Monty M. Denneau	Y0999-493-(8728-334)	9035
7590 02/04/2004			EXAMINER	
Frank Chau Esq			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
F Chau & Associates LLP 1900 Hempstead Turnpike			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 501			2143	
East Meadow,	NY 11554		DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u>.</u>	
41	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/525,707	DENNEAU ET AL.	
·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David E. England	2143	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ich places the applic	ply to a cation in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date o			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mote armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I		,	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on 12 January 2004 is	s a)⊠ approved or b)∏ disar	proved by the Exar	miner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	•	•	
10 Other:	(5)(1 · • 1440) / apol 110(5).	<u> </u>	

DAVID WILEY SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claim language of claim 1 and 4 still do not disclose what is shown in the drawings. The limitations of, "wrapped paths", along with the limitation of, "wrapping around a first end processor, proceeding to and wrapping around a second end processor", would suggest or could be interpreted as the first end processor is connected to a second end processor. If the Applicant were to modify these limitations to teach more in the aspect of the invention, wrapping back to the same first end processor or the like, it could put the application in better light to be allowable but would require further search and consideration. It is encouraged that the Applicant contact the Examiner to discuss claim language that could put the application in consideration for allowance.